

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0121790 (Wolff et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,711,011 (Urs et al.).

By the present response, Applicant has amended the claims 1-3 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-3 remain pending in the present application.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. in view of Urs et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the following remarks.

Regarding claims 1-3, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims. For example, Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose or suggest recording the conference call within the network infrastructure of the mobile telephone network used to broadcast the conference call in response to a signal from the group member, as recited in the claims of the present application. The Examiner now asserts that these limitations are disclosed in Wolff et al. at paragraphs 18, 19, 39 and 47. However, Wolff et al. merely discloses that the AIRS continuously monitors and records audio information communicated between communication devices used by members of a group, and that AIRS may be configured to monitor and record the audio information for a period of time specified by a user. This is not recording the conference call within the network infrastructure of the mobile telephone network used to broadcast the conference call in response to a signal from the group member that initiated the conference call by sending a request, as recited in the claims of the present application. Wolff et al. merely discloses all audio information communications between devices used by members of a group being continuously monitored. This monitoring does not occur in response to a signal from the group member that initiated the conference call. Further, the disclosure in Wolff et al. of monitoring and recording the audio information for a

period of time specified by a user of the Wolf invention does not disclose or suggest that the user is a group member or a group member that initiated the conference call by sending a request, as recited in the claims of the present application. Urs also fails to disclose or suggest these limitations.

In addition, none of the cited references disclose or suggest the conference call being stored as a series of short monologue files, one monologue file for each change of speaker, each monologue file being stamped and stored with an identity of the associated speaker, as recited in the claims of the present application. The Examiner asserts that these limitations are disclosed in Wolf et al. at paragraphs 76-80, 27, 64-65 and Figs 5A-E. However, these portions merely disclose storing of a conversation between several persons where details of the conversation such as the total length, date and time, and what portions are attributable to which persons are presented on a display allowing a user to control playing back of the conversation. Wolf et al. discloses storing the entire conversation as one audio file and identifying portions of the single file that are attributable to which persons when the audio conversation is presented on a display. This is not the conference call being stored as a series of short monologue files, one monologue file for each change of speaker, each monologue file being stamped and stored with an identity of the associated speaker, as recited in the claims of the present application. Wolf et al. discloses storing the entire conversation as one audio file.

Further, none of the cited references disclose or suggest transferring the recorded conference call to a voicemail server and copying the recorded conference call to a mailbox of the mobile telephone device users that did not participate in the conference call. The Examiner asserts that Wolff et al. discloses these limitations in paragraphs 28-30, 34 and 72. However, as noted previously, Wolff merely discloses using an audio information recorder system (AIRS) to monitor and record communications between communication devices (see, paragraph 27). This is not transferring the recorded conference call to a voice mail server, as recited in the claims of the present application. AIRS is merely an audio information recorder system (see, par. 190) and may even be incorporated as part of one of the communication devices (see, par. 20). The AIRS disclosed in Wolff et al. is not a voicemail server, as recited in

the claims of the present application. Urs also fails to disclose or suggest these limitations.

Moreover, none of the cited references disclose or suggest copying the recorded conference call to a mailbox of the mobile telephone device users that did not participate in the conference call. The Examiner asserts that Wolff et al. discloses these limitations in paragraphs 34 and 72. However, Wolff et al. merely discloses that AIRS archives audio information corresponding to conversations (see, par. 27) and that users may retrieve the archived audio information, where users may be members of one or more groups, other users who may not be members of any group, and others (see, par. 28). Wolff et al. discloses merely storing the audio information for general access by anyone. Wolff does not disclose or suggest a mailbox of mobile telephone device users, or copying the recorded conference call to a mailbox of the mobile telephone device users, or copying the recorded conference call to a mailbox of the mobile telephone device users that did not participate in the conference call. Urs also fails to disclose or suggest these limitations. The disclosure in Wolff et al. of storing the audio information for general access by anyone does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-3 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-3 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions about the present amendment or anticipates finally rejecting any claim of the present application, a telephone interview is requested.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4365.

Respectfully submitted,

Troy Bourgeois
(Applicant)



Date: March 24, 2009

Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282
Moore & Van Allen PLLC
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709
Telephone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199